

Application No. 09/964,318
Amendment "A" dated February 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed November 23, 2004

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on January 10, 2005. The claim amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview.

The first Office Action, mailed November 23, 2004, considered and rejected claims 1-34. Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Daswani (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,565). Claims 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daswani in view of Salo (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,148)¹.

By this paper, each of the independent claims 1, 8, 17, 24 and 33 have been amended and new claims 36-38 have been added, such that claims 1-38 remain pending. Support for the new claims and amendments can be found throughout the specification of the application, including, but not limited to paragraphs [034]-[036], [039] and [041].

As discussed during the interview, the present claims are primarily directed to embodiments in which a device prompts a user with notifications regarding newly received objects, such that the user can accept or reject the objects, and prior to the objects being stored in persistent memory of the device and without first being processed by corresponding applications at the receiving device. This can be useful, for example, to help provide additional security for preventing unwanted or harmful objects from adversely affecting a user's device or corresponding applications.

There are five independent claims, 1, 8, 17, 24 and 33. Claims 1 and 17 are directed to similar embodiments, with claim 1 using functional 'step for' language and claim 8 using

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Application No. 09/964,318
Amendment "A" dated February 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed November 23, 2004

corresponding nonfunctional 'acts' language. Claims 17 and 24, on the other hand, are directed to computer program products for implementing the methods recited in claims 1 and 8, respectively. Claim 33 is directed to a similar embodiment to claims 1 and 8, only further including the ability of the user to accept or reject all objects in a temporary queue at the same time and wherein only one object is received at a time, with all other object transfers being ignored until a current object transfer is complete.

The new claims added by this paper further clarify embodiments in which the notification to the user is generated with information from an object transfer, rather than the object itself (claim 36), wherein a user is prompted multiple times to accept or reject the object (claim 37), and wherein the notification also indicates a total number of objects that are stored in the temporary queue (claim 38).

These embodiments, as well as the other claimed embodiments recited in the pending claims, are neither anticipated by nor made obvious in view of the cited art. In fact, as discussed during the interview, the cited art does not even address the security problem for which the present invention provides a solution. Instead, Daswani is directed to systems and methods incorporating a special data center for restructuring and transforming the formats of the data being transmitted over networks. Col. 2, ln. 66 thru Col. 4, ln. 46. Salo, on the other hand, is directed to remote access to networks. (title)

As discussed during the interview, Daswani and Salo fail, singly and in combination, to disclose or suggest any method or system in which notifications are generated in response to objects being received at a device and wherein the notifications are used to prompt a user to either accept or reject the objects, prior to the objects being stored in persistent memory at the receiving device and prior to processing the objects at the receiving device with corresponding


Application No. 09/964,318
Amendment "A" dated February 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed November 23, 2004

applications, and wherein objects that are rejected are deleted in such a way that the receiving device never processes them with the corresponding applications and such that the deleted objects are never stored in the persistent memory of the receiving device, as claimed.

For at least these reasons, as well as the others that were discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for prompt allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 23 day of February, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCJ:cm
W:\13768\214\CM0000005224V001.DOC